

**Sureśvara's Vārtika on
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad [1.5.1-154]**

Shoun Hino

अथ यो मिति ग्रन्थादारभ्योरुप्रयत्नतः ।
अविद्यायाः समाम्नाता आ समाप्तेर्विभूतयः ॥१॥
अध्यायस्यात्र चाविद्वान्वर्णाद्यात्मभिमानवान् ।
धर्मेण नियतात्मा सञ्जहोत्यादिस्वकर्मभिः ॥२॥
देवादिक्रिमिपर्यन्तं बिभर्ति जगदव्ययम् ।
एवमेव जगद्योनिरेकैकः कर्मकृन्नरः ॥३॥

Having begun in the statement *atho 'nyām* up to the end of this chapter there have been enumerated with great care¹ various expressions² of ignorance and in this connection one who is ignorant, and who has a regard for Varna etc., being controlled in himself with Dharma (performance of religious duty), performing his own duties, viz. offering oblations etc.

[1-2]

sustains this world without perishing³ beginning with gods etc. and ending with insects— just in this way creator of this world becomes each one of sacrificer human being.

[3]

In BUBV 1.1-2 the worship of deity, and then death are described and the becoming of sacrificer is led to being identical with deity=Agni=Prāṇa. In BUBV 1.3 the Udgītha gāna which sacrificer sings is one raised in the highest level, viz. most potential part of sacrifice. And BUBV 1.4 the performer himself is said in terms of human sacrificer. Thus slow change of process is noticed in foregone chapters and this chapter of Saptāṇna 'seven foods' describes reality as a creator of food.

¹SP says *urprayatna*.

²It is alternatively said modifications.

³It is for *avyaya*.

कृत्स्नेन जगता यद्वद्वकर्मकृत्समुपाजितः ।
यथोक्तकर्मभिस्तेन जगत्तद्वदुपाजितम् ॥४॥

As a performer of (sacrificial) activities was obtained by entire world (of human beings) by (the performance of) ritual activities as prescribed (in the Śāstras); in the same way by that ¹ (this entire) world is obtained. [4]

¹It means: *karmakṛt*.

स्वदेहवद्यतो भुङ्क्त एकैको वशेषतः ।
साधारणानि वस्तूनि तथासाधारणान्यपि ॥५॥

Since each one of human beings enjoys all of common things without exception in the same way he enjoys even uncommon things even as his own duties. [5]

This verse justifies verse 4.

स्वकर्मणानुपात्तस्य न च भोगो दृश्यते ।
एकैकेनोपकारित्वात्तस्माज्जगदुपाजितम् ॥६॥

Here is not seen any enjoyment of what is not obtained by one's own performance of duty therefore since each one of (human being) is helpful the world is (described as) what is obtained (by each one). [6]

This verse justifies verse 4.

For every enjoyment there needs an enjoyer. Things of the world are enjoyable therefore each human being is described here as an enjoyer or an obtainer.

This is the reference to *bhogyā* in earlier texts.

स्वभावतो लं कर्म धर्माधर्मादिलक्षणम् ।
साधारणविशेषात्मफलारभते द्विधा ॥७॥

All (ritual act) is by its nature characterizes as either Dharma or Adharma and it begins (lit. products) twofold fruits: general and particular ¹. [7]

This verse justifies the word *svakarmanā* in the preceding verse.

¹ 'General' refers to *adr̥ṣṭa* and 'particular' refers to performance becoming rich attaining a heaven.

गुणप्रधानभावेन साधारणविशेषतः ।
सूत्रादेः कर्मणः कार्यं क्रिम्यन्तस्याभिजायते ॥८॥

In the case of beings, beginning with Sūtra and ending with insects there are produced results of activities which are in relation of principal and subordinate, being general or particular. [8]

This verse justifies the word *miśra* as understood from *ādi* in the preceding verse. See note above.

द्रव्यादिदर्शनाधीनं फलं सर्वस्य कर्मणः ।
साधारणादिसंभेदभिन्नं तेन क्रियाफलम् ॥९॥

In the case of all activity (it is seen that) the result depends upon material etc. ¹ which is noticed (in use); therefore the result of activities is characterized as a mixture of general etc. [9]

¹This refers to *kriyā* etc.

द्वचित्साधारणात्मैव तथासाधारणं द्वचित् ।
द्वचिच्चोभयथा कार्यं द्रव्यादीक्षणचित्रतः ॥१०॥

In some case the result is of general nature, similarly in some others particular and in yet some others of both (i.e. of mixture)— (this is so) on account of the variety noticed in

material etc.

[10]

समासव्यासतस्माद्यथोक्तज्ञानकर्मभिः ।
एकैकेन जगत्कृत्स्नमुपात्तं भोगसिद्धये ॥११॥

Therefore each one (of the human being) has obtained entire world for the acquisition of pleasure by knowledge and activities already stated by them jointly and severally. [11]

सर्वः सर्वस्य कर्ता च कार्यं चापि यथा तथा ।
मधुविद्याप्रसङ्गेन विस्पष्टमभिधास्यते ॥१२॥

It will be closely explained in the context of the lore of Madhu as to how all is the agent of and so also effect (thereof). [12]

यदजीजनत्फलं कर्ता सवकर्मज्ञानसाधनः ।
सप्तान्नप्रविभागेन तद्विभज्य प्रतददर्श्यते ॥१३॥

Now is explained the varied result in seven categories of foods namely that which the agent, possessing the means of his activity and knowing, and produced (thereby). [13]

SP supplies *dhyānārtham ity śeṣaḥ*. This means for *upāsanā* (NKL). This word *dhyāna* or *upāsanā* becomes significant in relation to a few following verses.

त्रीण्यन्नानि फलं कर्तुश्चत्वार्यन्नानि यानि तु ।
प्रयोगसमवायित्वात्तानि स्युः कर्मसाधनम् ॥१४॥

The result (of the activity) of the agent are three foods and those (others) which are four foods that are inseparably connected with performance are all together the means of (individual's) activity. [14]

Seven foods that are discussed are divided into two groups:

(1) *manas*, Vāk and Prāṇa together form one and these three do not become connected with actual performance, viz. ritual activity, (2) the commonly eaten food, *huta* (what is poured into fire) and *prahuta* (what is offered on the hand of a priest) for gods (two foods) and that given to animals, viz. milk. In respect of first group we cannot overlook that whatever is created was for the enjoyment of sacrificer (*sarvaṃ sarvasya bhogyam*).

Verses 15-97 are the discussion of BU 1.5.2.

विज्ञानात्मा पिता तावन्न मनो न प्रजापतिः ।
अविशिष्टाधिकारित्वान्न विज्ञानात्मनो रः ॥१५॥

To begin with (I state) that the the individual self (who possesses) knowledge is the father (of the creation); not *manas*, not also Prajāpati¹. (This is so) because (anything) else than the individual self possessing knowledge is not a specified and eligible performer. [15]

¹ = Hiranyagarbha.

सिसृक्षितत्वान्मनसस्तथा त्र्यन्नात्मनः प्रभोः ।
साधारणात्मनः स्रष्टा नातः क्षेत्रज्ञतो रः ॥१६॥

Since *manas* is contemplating on account of creation and also (*tathā*) (since Prajāpati is) the master who is the common self and is comprised of three foods. There is not¹ a creator other than knower of field. [16]

Though reference was made as to *manas* as *sīrṣṣita* it should not be overlooked that Prajāpati also was product produced by Ātman. Cf. *dvayor api sṛṣṭiniviṣṭatvena kāryakoṭiniviṣṭatān na kāraṇatvam ity arthah* (SP).

¹ = cannot be.

ग्रन्थार्थधारणाशक्तिर्मेधा यद्यपि भण्यते ।

तथापि ज्ञानमेवेह साधनत्वाद्विवक्षितम् ॥१७॥

Even if it is said (i.e. is understood) that *medhā* (means) capacity to grasp (or better retain) meaning of a work (studied); yet, here in this context it is intended to express only knowledge since it is a means (to ritual activity)¹ [17]

This verse explains the word *medhā* in the statement of the BU *medhayā 'janayat pitā*.

¹This is to exclude the lore of the Brahman.

शास्त्रीयलौकिकज्ञानविशेषग्रहसिद्धये ।
सामान्यज्ञानग्रहणं मेधयेत्यभिधित्सितम् ॥१८॥

By the word *medhayā* it is intended to express the grasping of very common knowledge— with a view to establishing the non-distinction between knowledge acquired from Śāstras and from worldly (dealings). [18]

One may call here how Śaṅkara has in his *Adhyāsabhāṣya* pointed to the similarity between worldly and Śāstric dealings.

This verse intends to avert the probable notion on the part of the reader of the Upaniṣad that references to knowledge has connection with *dhyāna/upāsanā* and which was in the context (from third Brāhmaṇa; and cf. *jñānenājanayad ity ukte dhyānenaivety prakaraṇānurodhī bhramah syāt tannivṛttyartham madhāgrahanam ...* (SP).

तपःशब्देन कृच्छ्रादि यदि नामाभिधीयते ।
तथापि कर्मग्रहणं सप्तान्नोद्धृतिहेतुतः ॥१९॥

Though indeed by the words *tapas* is expressed (activity) such as *kṛcchra* even then (here) is to be understood an activity (in general) for it is the cause of production of the seven fold foods. [19]

धिया धियेति लिङ्गाच्च गृह्यते ज्ञानकर्मणी ।

मेधातपोगिरा नान्ये ग्राह्ये तदफलत्वतः ॥२०॥

Also from the indicatory mark *dhiyā dhiyā janayati karmabhih* are understood knowledge and activity (of the ritual); (therefore) by the words *medhā* and *tapas* two other meanings¹ are not to be understood for they do not have any fruit.²

[20]

¹*medhā* means grasping, and *tapas* means practising penances.

²That is, they do not raise sacrificer to the status of Prajāpati and are in no way responsible for creation of the world.

पाङ्क्तं हि प्रकृतं कर्म वेदेति ज्ञानमेव च ।

विहाय नातः प्रकृतं युक्तो कृतसंग्रहः ॥२१॥

Indeed what is contextual is the five fold activity; and knowledge (which is contextual) is expressed by the word *veda* 'he knew.'; therefore it is not proper to accept what is non-contextual by setting aside what is contextual. [21]

This is the conclusion from the discussion of *medhā* and *tapas*.

मेधातपोतिरेकेण नान्यत्स्यात्साधनं यतः ।

प्रसिद्धत्वादतो हीति व्याचष्टे श्रुतिरञ्जसा ॥२२॥

Since there is no means in addition (=beside) *medhā* and *tapas* to ritual activity therefore the Śruti has clearly stated the words *ato hi* since the two are known (means of activity).

[22]

This brings out the stress in *medhayā hi tapasājanayat pitā* (BU 1.4.17).

अस्य भोक्तृसमूहस्य साधारणमचीकलृपत् ।

एकमन्नं पिता सृष्ट्वा तच्चेदं यदिहाद्यते ॥२३॥

Father (of the creation or the world) intended one common food for this (entire) mass of enjoyer and after his having created that this food is what is eaten here (by all). [23]

यदिदं प्राणिभिर्नित्यमद्यते रहस्तृषा ।
साधारणमिदं युक्तं सर्वभूतस्थितेस्ततः ॥२४॥

Since this (food) is even eaten by (all) beings day after day and with relish (lit. thirst) therefore this is properly (called) common (for all) on account of its being the support of all the being. [24]

स य एतदुपास्ते मसाधारणरूपतः ।
पाप्मनो नैव स द्रष्टा व्यावर्तत इहातुरः ॥२५॥

He who worships this (common) food, holding it as uncommon does not keep from (the sin), since that seer is afflicted¹ in respect of this². [25]

This has a reference to BU 1.5.2: *sa ya etat upāste*.

¹The word *ātura* means: person has become weak in his understanding of significance of food since he uses the food only for himself. In other words he does not hold it as food to be commonly shared.

²This is for *iha* = *annaviniyogavacana* (SP).

उपासनं च तात्पर्यमिह श्रुत्याभिधीयते ।
मोघमन्नमिति तथा मन्त्रे ताच्छील्यनिन्दनम् ॥२६॥

In respect of this¹ *upāsana* means being devoted (addicted) to that²— thus it is said in the Śruti, viz. in the Mantra: *mogham annam ...*³ and so also there is censure of being attached to that² [26]

¹Cf. SP: *sādhāraṇam annam saptamyarthah* (= *ihārthah*).

² *sādhāraṇam ... annam = iha.*

³ *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 2.8.8: moghamannaṁ apracetāḥ satyaṁ bravīmi vadha it sa tasya / nāryamāṇam puṣyati no sakhāyaṁ kevalādho bhavati kevalādī /* This is Arthavāda in respect of common food enjoyed by only person who is the sacrificer.

वैश्वदेवं हि नामैतद्यदन्नमुपसाध्यते ।
नालमेतद्धि सर्वेषां पाप्मनां विनिवृत्तये ॥२७॥
इत्येवं केचिदिच्छन्ति तत्तु युक्त्या न युज्यते ।
अनूक्तेर्यदिदमिति सिद्धो अनूद्यते यतः ॥२८॥
प्रात्यक्ष्यं न च तस्यास्ति शास्त्रमात्रप्रमाणतः ।
यथा सर्वात्तृवक्त्रान्तस्थस्य प्रत्यक्षता तथा ॥२९॥

It is indeed this food which is utilized (*upasādhya*) for (performance of) Vaiśvadeva; certainly this (food) is not capable of removing (or warding off) all the sins— [27] thus some¹ hold. But that is not proper owing to a reason, viz. since it is given without a basis in (the Śruti-) statement— thus here is restatement of what is already established. [28] And that food (Vaiśvadeva) is not directly perceptible as such for it is understood only from Śāstra² (it does not have that direct perceptibility which food that enters into mouths of all eaters has noticed. [29]

¹ This is reference to *Bhārtr̥prapañca*.

² Refer to *Manusmṛti* 3.84; 3.121.

प्रतिप्राणि ममेदं स्यादभिलाषश्च दृश्यते ।
सर्वप्राण्यम्शमिश्रत्वं ततो न्नवसीयते ॥३०॥

And it is noticed in the case of every being that there is a desire, 'May this be mind.' therefore it is concluded that in respect of this (food for Vaiśvadeva) there is the character of the share for all beings. [30]

This is Sureśvara's conclusion in respect of food for Vaiśvadeva.

For this reason Vaiśvadeva food also cannot be exception to what is called food that is no enjoyed in common.

नात्मार्थम् पाचयेदन्नमिति चापि स्मृतेर्वचः ।
तैर्दत्तानप्रदायैभ्यो यो भुङ्क्ते स्तेन एव सः ।
अन्नादे भूणहा माष्टीत्यादीह वचनं स्मृतेः ॥३१॥

Also there is a statement of Smṛti, viz. 'One should not get food cooked for oneself.'¹; so also there are such statements² from Smṛti as 'He is indeed a robber who enjoys them from which he does not give to others....'³ (and) 'He transfers his sin to the eater of his food—the one who is the killer of a foetus.'⁴ [31]

¹ *Gītā* 3.13ab; cp. *Manusmṛti* 3.18.

² *vacanam* stands for *vacanāni*. (*jātam ekavacanam*)

³ Cp. *Manusmṛti* 3.115 & 117.

⁴ *Manusmṛti* 8.317

तस्यापि चान्तःपातित्वात्सर्वाद्यस्यैव युक्तिमान् ।
ग्रहस्तस्य गृहीतौ तु नास्यान्तःपातिता तथा ॥३२॥

Since that¹ also falls (included) in general food it is only proper to refer (the earlier Arthavāda) to all food that is commonly eater). As against this if only that¹ is understood, then it would not be included in (general food). [32]

¹ It means: Vaiśvadeva food.

असृष्टाविनियोगत्वे प्रप्नुतस्तद्ग्रहे सति ।
सर्वप्राणिभिराद्यस्य तच्चानिष्टं प्रसज्यते ॥३३॥

If that is understood (under reference in connection with injunction) then there follow (contingently two faults: *asṛṣṭatva* 'not being created (by the father, the sacrificer' and *aviniyogatva* 'not being employed in ritual'. [33]

This is further clarified in the next verse.

अव्यावृत्तिश्च पाप्मभ्यो वैश्वदेवान्नसंग्रहे ।
न न्याय्यं वचनं तस्य शास्त्रमात्रव्यपाश्रयात् ॥३४॥

Also not keeping from sins by accepting food of Vaiśvadeva is not reasonable¹, since that² has a basis in nearly Śāstra this food is not eaten in ordinary way like any other *kāmya* 'desired food'. [34]

¹It means: not in keeping with teaching of the scriptures.

²It means: Vaiśvadeva food.

अल्पीयः पाहानिश्च नापि शब्दात्प्रतीयते ।
न स पाप्मन इत्यस्मादश्रुता न च गृह्यते ॥३५॥

And also it is not understood from the injunction (regarding Vaiśvadeva) that there is the removal of (only) a little sin. For that being understood it would be taken that the statement of *na sa pāpmana* ... (leads to that) though it is not heard there. [35]

सर्वाद्यान्नगृहीतौ तु हेतुर्गमक इष्यते ।
असाधारणकारित्वं तस्य साधारणात्मनः ॥३६॥

And there is accepted an indication (in the statement of) the cause for understanding all eatable food: That food being shared by all in general then in the case of that person who makes it uncommon it becoming uncommonly (shared food) [and that is the meaning of word *miśra*.] [36]

In BU sentence *sādhāraṇa* food is described as *miśra* 'commonly shared by all'.

सर्वप्राणभृदन्नस्य तस्माद्ग्रहणमिष्यते ।

उक्तौयुक्तिबलादत्र नान्यस्येति विनिश्चितिः ॥३७॥

Therefore it is desired to understand (in this context only) that food (which is eaten by) all living beings. (Thus) on the strength of reasons stated decision is not (acceptance) of any other (food). [37]

पापानिमोक्तहेतूक्तिर्मिश्रमित्यभिधीयते ।
सर्वार्थस्य हि पापाय यतो धारणीक्रिया ॥३८॥

The statement of the word *miśra* is that of cause for the non-removal of sin: For making uncommon what is meant for all is to result into sin. [38]

प्रक्षेपो हुतं विद्यात्तत्पूर्वं बलिकर्म च ।
प्रहुतं चेह विज्ञेयं ते देवेभ्यो ददौ पिता ॥३९॥

[Verses 39-45 explain the meaning of *dve devānabhājayat*.]

One should understand offering (of food) into the fire as *huta* and every ritual oblation is preceded by that (*huta*) and here is understood that as *prahuta* which the sacrificer gave to (as intended for) the gods. [39]

देवेभ्यो यतः प्रत्ते हुतप्रहुतलक्षणे ।
तानुद्दिश्य ततो पि जुहति प्र च जुहति ॥४०॥

And since two foods characterized as *huta* and *prahuta*, were (in the yore) offered to the gods as intended for them therefore even today a person pours the oblation into the fire and also offers them (outside the fire) intending for them. [40]

This verse explains the word *tasmād* in the Śruti.

यतः सूत्रपदे द्वित्वमविशेषेण चोदितम् ।
श्रौतस्मार्त्तिविभागेन तत एतद्विकल्पितम् ॥४१॥

Now here is stated the purport of the Śruti statement *atho āhuḥ*. This is to explain the twofold mention *juhōti* and *prajuhōti*¹ in the previous verse. Since the twofold (character of the oblation) is stated (lit. enjoined) in the Sūtra (=Śruti-Mantra) without any specification.² Therefore this is given in two options as divided into Śrauta and Smārta. [41]

This gives a reason for a doubt that the words Śrauta and Smārta referring foods for gods can belong to *huta* and *prahuta* varieties in general and also to oblations in the *darśa* and *pūrṇamāśśa* sacrifices. and this doubt justifies the first line of next verse.

¹Cf. *atho āhuḥ darśapūrṇamāśāv iti*.

²That is, without any specific mention of two distinct entities.

स्मार्तान्नानन्तरोक्तत्वात्स्मार्तत्वं स्याद्वयोस्तयोः ।
अग्निहोत्राभिसंबन्धात्स्यातां वा श्रुतिचोदिते ॥४२॥

The two (*huta* and *prahuta* mentioned earlier) would be characterized as Smārta since the Smārta food is mentioned immediately after; or rather (both these) can be regarded as stated (i.e. enjoined) in the Śruti since they have a connection with the Agnihotra. [42]

मन्त्रे द्वित्वाविशिष्टत्वाद्धृतप्रहुतलक्षणे ।
श्रुत्यातस्ते विकल्प्येते श्रौते स्मार्ते हि तुल्यवत् ॥४३॥

(The two divine foods) characterized as *huta* and *prahuta* are not specified by the Śruti in the Mantra as twofold. Therefore they are subjected to a doubt (by an opponent) but both the Śrauta and Smārta are equal (in status). [43]

दर्शश्च पौर्णमासश्च देवान्ने ते यतः श्रुते ।
प्रायस्ताभ्यां न कामाय यष्टव्यमिति गम्यते ॥४४॥

Since two foods (of) *darśapūrṇamāsa* (sacrifice) are heard (i.e. enjoined) in the Śruti therefore it is understood that they should not be performed for obtaining the desire. [44]

This explains Śruti statement *tasmān neṣṭyājukaḥ syāt*.

नेहेष्टयो निषिध्यन्ते देवप्राधान्यसिद्धये ।
ताच्छीलिकोकञ्श्रवणात्तच्छीलत्वं निवार्यते ॥४५॥

Here ¹ *iṣṭis* (small rites performed with desires) are not negated in order that the principle significance of the deity be established; by the mention (lit. hearing) of the suffix *ukañ* which goes with (refers to) one in the habit of performing that (rite) is ward off character of the sacrificer given to its performance by habit. [45]

This explains the significance of the suffix *ukañ* in *iṣṭiyājuka* and also explain away possible doubt that with *darśa* and *pūrṇamāsa* are performed with desire for heaven.

The author stresses on the significance of the form *iṣṭiyājuka* and points out *darśa* and *pūrṇamāsa* rites, though performed with desire, are not performed by mere habit. Thus only habitual performance of rites is ward off.

¹That is, in the statement *iṣṭiyājukaḥ*...

प्रसक्तान्यपि नोच्यन्ते त्रीण्यन्नान्यत्र कारणात् ।
तेषां फलत्वादुक्तेभ्यः साधनेभ्यो ता यतः ॥४६॥
सौकर्यप्रतिपत्तेश्च भूयोविषयतस्तथा ।
साधनैकसजातित्वादानन्तर्यमकारणम् ॥४७॥

Here (i.e. in the Brāhmaṇa) three foods, though contingent ¹ for (good) reason are not spoken of (first) because of their character as the fruit (resulting) from those (i.e. the foods) which are mentioned (earlier) and (thus) there is difference of them from those means (to fruits). [46]
And also (this is) for understanding with ease and so also

because they (the three foods) cover quite a large sphere of things. (The seventh food is mentioned together with first three) because it has the same character as theirs, viz. of a means (cause). The immediate following of the three (*sādhya*) foods is without any (specific) purpose. [47]

A Vārtika (of course following Bhāṣya) has proceeded to explain the seventh food (*paśvanna*) immediately after first three are explained and has thus ignored for the time being three foods which are mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa before that (*paśvanna*)— this is, in other words to explain the purpose of what is called *pāṭhakramātikrama* 'varying the sequence in the original text'.

This explains how the Vārtika and Bhāṣya refer to the less authoritativeness of the *pāṭhakrama* than that of *arthakrama* (the sequence of the purpose) that it is an accepted principle that *arthakrama* is stronger than *pāṭhakrama*.

¹Cf. SP: *pāṭhakramāt kāraṇāt praptāni*.

पयो मेव प्रायेण मनुष्याः पशुभिः सह ।
भुञ्जते पय एवाग्रे तेषामन्नमतो तत् ॥४८॥

The word *payas* means only food; generally human beings, along with (as well as) animals, enjoy only milk in the beginning, therefore let that be food. [48]

भुञ्जते पय एवाग्रे क्रमेणान्यत्तृणादि हि ।
अतो मीयते पित्रा तेभ्यः प्रतं पयः पुरा ॥४९॥

They (animals) eat, enjoy milk first and thus gradually, graze (lit. eat grass) etc. For this reason it is concluded¹ that the father gave them (men and animals) milk before (anything else). [49]

¹*anumīyate = dr̥ṣṭānusārāt kalpyate*: So it is understood on the basis of what is seen in life of humans and animals (SP).

पशवः पय एवाग्रे भुञ्जते नापरं ततः ।
कथमेतद्विजानीम इत्येतदभिधीयते ॥५०॥

Animals¹ enjoy only with first not anything else than that;
how we know this is now explained (in the following verses).

[50]

¹This refers to human as well as animal because Śruti considers both bipeds and quadrupeds.

यत एवमतो लोके कुमारं जातमग्रतः ।
जातरूपव्यवहितं लेहयन्ति घृतं जनाः ॥५१॥

Since this is so therefore in the world the people first make
a new born child lick ghee in touch with (touched by or rubbed
on) (a piece of) gold.

[51]

Since ghee is a product of milk it is therefore identified with
it.

तस्यानु तदभावे वा पाययन्ति स्तनं शिशुम् ।
पशुष्वपि तथा जातं वत्सम् कश्चित्प्रपृच्छति ॥५२॥
कियांस्ते वयसा वत्स इत्याचष्टे वयो यथा ।
अतृणाद इति तृणं नाद्याप्यति मनागपि ॥५३॥

Only after that (doing) or in the absence of that they put
the child on (the mother's) breast. So also in the case of
animals (they do the same) in the case of a new born calf.
Some one asks:

[52]

'How old is your child (or the calf)?' Thus (asked) one stated
the age in this manner: 'It is not yet an eater of grass, that
is it does not eat even a little of grass.'

[53]

वर्तते पयसैवासावद्यापीत्यवसीयते ।
प्राण्यप्राणि जगत्सर्वं तस्मिन्नेव प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥५४॥

(This means:) It subsists on only milk yet— so is this understood for all the world comprising living and non-living beings¹, is supported on that (i.e. milk only). [54]

¹Literally it means: whatever being that breathes and whatever thing that does not breathe.

पयसीदं जगन्मग्नमित्येतद्गम्यते कृतः ।
प्रसिद्धेर्गम्यते न्यायाद्यतो वभिधीयते ॥५५॥

‘When is it understood that this world is supported only by milk?’ (Someone asks.) (The answer is:) ‘So is it understood for the reason, viz. non-usage.’¹ [55]

¹SP: *śrautaprasiddher eva nyāyah.*

आहुतिः पय एव स्यादाज्यं वा पय एव वा ।
पय एवाहुतिः सर्वमित्येतच्च श्रुतेर्मितेः ॥५६॥

An offering into fire should be of only milk or of clarified butter or milk— all that is offering is but milk. And this is inferred (i.e. understood) from the Śruti. [56]

Here Vārtika refers to the non-usage among the ritualist which, they hold, has come from some Śruti. Cf. BSB: *śiṣṭacānumitaśrutiḥ pramāṇatvāt*

अथैषाज्याहुतिर्यज्ञे यद्विः सर्वरूपकम् ।
पशुश्चाप्याज्यमेवैतत्करोतीत्यपि चागमः ॥५७॥

Now, this is the offering of the clarified butter in a sacrifice which are offerings of all forms¹ are but an offering. [57]

This verse paraphrases a Śruti which in support of the said known usage.

¹Or alternatively, which is an offering having various forms.

आज्याभिघारसंस्कारात्सर्वमेव पयो हविः ।
पयस्येव जगत्कृत्स्नमग्निहोत्रे प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥५८॥

Indeed all offering is but milk on account of its purification by sprinkling of clarified butter on it. (Therefore) the entire world is thus supported in (or established in) but milk, that is Agnihotra. [58]

This states the influence drawn from Śruti.

ते वा एते इति तथा परिणामो लं जगत् ।
अग्निहोत्राहुतेः साक्षाच्छ्रुतावेव समीरितम् ॥५९॥

To that effect is stated in the Śruti itself pertaining to Agnihotra offerings: *eva ete* ... to mean two offerings and their modifications is all this world. [59]

अग्नौ प्रास्ताहुतिः सम्यगादित्यमुपरिष्ठते ।
आदित्याज्जायते वृष्टिर्वृष्टेरन्नं ततः प्रजाः ॥६०॥

He who has poured his offering into the fire well attends on the sun from Āditya proceeds rain, from rain food and thence created beings. [60]

Refer to *Gītā* 3.14.

पयोद्रव्याहुतेश्चैतत्परिणामो लं जगत् ।
एतच्च श्रुतितः सिद्धं विश्वमाहुतिकारणम् ॥६१॥

And¹ this entire world is but modification of offering of material, viz. milk— and this is established from (statement in) Śruti: All the world has offering as its cause. [61]

With reference to two *cas* read SP: *apūrvasamgrahārtham ādyaś*

cakāro dvitīyah smṛtisamuccayārthah.

यथोक्तदर्शनस्तुत्यै दर्शनान्तरकुत्सनम् ।
तस्मिन्सर्वमिति ह्यस्य दर्शनस्य विधित्सया ॥६२॥

(Now follows) censure on the view of another with a view to praise the already stated view, viz. in that (offering of milk) all (the world is) supported— this is done with a desire to enjoining (the adoption of the first) view. [62]

पयसैवाग्निहोत्रं हि जुह्वत्संवत्सरं द्विजः ।
जयत्येव पुनर्मृत्युं न भूयो मृतिभाग्यवेत् ॥६३॥

Indeed twice born who offers for a year the Agnihotra by mere milk overcomes (lit. wins) death again and does not become a subject to death again. [63]

Now stated the other view.

संवत्सरे प्रयोगाणामग्निहोत्रे हि संख्यया ।
षष्ट्युत्तराणि त्रीण्येव शतानीति विनिश्चितम् ॥६४॥

It is decided that there are in number three hundred and sixty Agnihotra performance in a year. [64]

क्षाहान्यपि तावन्ति संख्ययेह भवन्ति हि ।
शतानि सप्त संख्याताः प्रयोगार्धाश्च विंशतिः ॥६५॥

Indeed days and nights also are a many in number (and therefore) the halves of performances (rituals) are numbered seven hundred and twenty. [65]

याजुष्मत्यो तावत्य इष्टकाः स्युः प्रजापतेः ।
संवत्सराग्नेश्चित्यस्य पुंसो नाड्यस्तथैव च ॥६६॥

Also as many are the bricks of Prajāpati¹ related to Yajus

Mantras and similarly the veins of man and the fire of worships
for the year. [66]

¹It is identified with Samvatsava.

संपदैवाहुतीर्विद्वान्संपाद्याग्नेस्तथेष्टकाः ।
संवत्सरमवाप्नोति स्वनाडीसंख्यया नरः ॥६७॥

By the production (of the sacrifice) a knower (of Vedic ritual)
will have produced bricks in a similar way and will thereafter
obtain the year (viz. the sacrifice or Prajāpati), through their
number equaling his own veins. [67]

Verses 64-67 have thus explained the idea of sacrificers
overcoming death.

पुमान्संवत्सरोश्च नाड्यहोरात्रयाजुषैः ।
संपदैते समाः सर्वे तस्मात्संवत्सरश्रुतिः ॥६८॥

A sacrifice (lit. man) a year and fire these are all equal by
the production through what belongs to Yajus Mantras (i.e.
bricks) and equaling in number the veins and the days and
nights. [68]

संवत्सरात्मसंपत्त्या कालात्मानं समश्नुते ।
इत्येवंदृष्टयो धीरो यदाहुरसदेव तत् ॥६९॥

Thus by producing (from himself) the nature (viz. form) of
a sacrifice (a sacrificer) attends to *kālātman* (? Prajāpati)—
all this which the wise ones have said on seeing thus is false
(i.e. wrong). [69]

पयस्यन्तर्हितं विश्वं पश्यन्नेवं पयो नरः ।
एकयैव स आहुत्या जगदात्मानमश्नुते ॥७०॥

Thus looking upon milk, viz. considering this entire world is

supported in milk, a man (sacrificer) obtains the Ātman of world through by a single offering. [70]

One does not have to keep on performing Agnihotra ritual for one year.

तत्रैवं सति को मूढोद्राधीयांसं प्रतीक्षते ।
संवत्सरावधिं कालं सकृदाहुतिसाधने ॥७१॥

This being so what fool would wait for a long time of a year's duration when there is (available) the means of securing (the Ātman of the world) through offering only once. [71]

This confirms why the author discards the earlier mentioned view.

पयो द्रव्यं यथातत्त्वदर्शी चेच्छद्भयान्वितः ।
यदैवाहर्जुहोतीत्थं हन्ति मृत्युं दतैव सः ॥७२॥
एकयैव स आहुत्या देवेभ्यो ह्यशेषडतः ।
प्रयच्छति यतो नातः प्रयोगान्तरमीक्ष्यते ॥७३॥
हुतमेवं जगत्कृत्स्नं नातो दवशिष्यते ।
यथोक्तदर्शनात्तस्मात्सर्वाप्त्या मृत्युजिद्ववेत् ॥७४॥

If one who sees the truth as (discussed just before) offers on some day the material, viz. milk, overcomes (lit. strikes down) death just then [72]

For, since he offers all food to the gods by a single offering (of milk), therefore there is no need of another performance (i.e. making any offering). [73]

Thus what is offered (in the form of milk) is the entire world and therefore there does not remain anything (to be offered) in accordance with the view that we have stated. Therefore the sacrificer would become a conqueror (lit. overcomer) of death through his obtaining all. ¹ [74]

Verse 72 is the explanation of sentence *yad ahar eva ...*

Verse 73 explains sentence *sarvam hi ...* and supplies the reason for the statement in verse 72 above.

Translation of verse 73 follows the reading *-īkṣyate* in the text and the NKL edition. However, the variant reading *-īkṣate* given in AnSS edition gives alternative translation which is better thus: One does not look (wait) for another performance (viz. making an offering).

Verse 74 sums up the reason for another holding the view stated so far.

¹This may refer to the whole world (*kṛtsnam jagat*) which is the same as *samvatsara* or *Prajāpati*. SP, however, refers all to becoming one with all gods which consequently results into absence of any further (birth and) death.

उक्तवद्बुद्धिं संभाव्य वक्ष्यमाणान्यपि श्रुतिः ।
अन्नानि कस्मादित्याह प्रश्नवाक्यविवक्षया ॥७५॥

(Now,) having considered what is stated before (viz. four foods,) the Śruti wishes to ask the question *kasmāt tāni* with reference to three foods which are to be stated also through the desire.

[75]

In the BU question *kasmāt tāni* occurs even before there is the statement of three remaining foods. The author explains the purport: Three foods to be stated are in nature similar to the earlier stated foods, viz. the creation of the sacrificer.

अद्यमानान्यथान्नानि यथोक्तान्यत्तृभिः सदा ।
कस्मात्क्षयं न संयान्ति यवपूर्णकुसूलवत् ॥७६॥

(A question arises:) Foods that are thus stated, ever being enjoyed (lit. eaten) by the eaters, why do they not get exhausted (i.e. do not decrease) just like a granary full of barley (and other corns)?

[76]

This explains the purport of *kasmāt tāni* and is the paraphrase

of the Upaniṣadic words *na kṣīyante 'dyamānāni*.

प्रश्नस्य कस्मात्तानीति श्रुत्यैवाचार्यभूतया ।
पुरुषो वा इति गिरा हेतुरुक्तो ये परः ॥७७॥

To the question *kasmāt tāni* asked by the Śruti who has (as if) become preceptor is stated (in answer) the subsequent reason for the non-decrease (of food) in the word(s) *puruṣo vā*. [77]

अद्यते चेत्सदैवान्नं जन्यते न तु तत्ततः ।
यथोक्तः स्यादयम् दोषो न तु तन्नेह जन्यते ॥७८॥

If food is (merely) ever eaten and is not produced from that (eater) then there could be this fault which is asked (by the questioner). But that is not so, it is (ever) produced. [78]

अन्नाक्षयत्वहेतुत्वात्पुरुषो तिष्ठत्यते ।
स हि धीहाप्रबन्धेन सर्वदान्नं करोत्यतः ॥७९॥

The sacrificer is called (one having) non-decrease since he is the cause of non-decreasing character of food— indeed by the continuity of Buddhi and performance¹ he ever produces food. [79]

This explains the meaning of the word *akṣiti* according to *hetuhetumatbhāva*.

¹The word *ihā* stands for *karma* as is warranted by the word *kriyābuddhi* in the following verse. Cf. BUBV 1.4.451 for example.

क्रियाबुद्धिप्रबन्धेन यतो भोक्ताप्यहर्निशम् ।
तदन्नं जनयत्येव तस्मादन्नं न हीयते ॥८०॥

Also since he is by discontinuity of Buddhi and performance even the enjoyer that is thus create the food and therefore food is never exhausted. [80]

भोगदस्यैव भोगेन सृज्यमानत्वहेतुतः ।
अन्नापक्षयो भवेदेवं तयोरव्यतिरेकतः ॥८१॥

On account of the enjoyment of what yields enjoyment owing to its being created there would be thus non-decrease of food thanks to the invariable¹ relation of the two (enjoyment and enjoyed) [81]

We have followed the reading in AnSS edition and the NKL reads *bhogādasyaiva* in place of *bhogadasyaiva*. It is difficult to decide whether following the latter is correct. AnSS edition and also SP understand continuity (*avyatireka* of *prabandha*) of enjoyment (which implies the enjoyer) and the enjoyed. NKL under verse 87 below explains *prabandha* by the words *gaṅgāpravāhavat srotorūpa*.

¹This is *avyatireka* 'absence of non-concomitance'.

सुखदुःखादिसंवित्तिः फलं पूर्वस्य कर्मणः ।
रागद्वेषक्रिया तत्र स्यात्फलान्तरसिद्धये ॥८२॥

Experience of pleasure, pain etc.¹ is the result of the former performances since there is the performance resulting into attachment and aversion indicative of the production of another result. [82]

One performs ritual actions and secures enjoyment and happiness which in turn produce attachment to and aversion for that *karma* and thus this produces continuity of action and the consequent production of food— this justifies *annākṣaya* in verse 81 above.

¹It refers to various particular forms of pleasure and pain.

रागादिपूर्वकं कर्म जायते फलवद्यतः ।
रागादिरहितं तत्तु निष्फलं सुप्तवागिव ॥८३॥

(This is so) since a performance preceded by attachment etc.¹ becomes fruitful and also that which is without attachment is fruitless like the chatter of a sleeper. [83]

This verse explains further the statement in verse 82.

This explanation is a good example of the author's use of *anvayavyatireka* method. Cf. our book [Vol.1:1982] Introduction.

को हेतुरक्षयत्वे स्यादिति पृष्ठमथाधुना ।
तद्विदः फलसिद्ध्यर्थं भूयः प्रश्नो मुच्यते ।
अक्षितित्वम् कथम् पुंस इत्येतच्चाधुनोच्यते ॥८४॥

Now it is then asked: What could be the cause of non-decreasing character (of food)— this question is asked once again with a view to establishing that there is a) positive) result for (the activity of) a knower of that.¹ And now it is later stated as to how is there the non-decreasing character of the sacrificer (also). [84]

¹It is *kriyābuddhiprabandha* in verse 80 above.

स हीदमन्नं कुरुते तत्तत्कालप्रसूतया ।
धिया धिया हि पुरुषः कर्माभिरचान्नमात्मनः ॥८५॥

Indeed he produces this food by every (new) thought and activity¹ which has occurred in his mind from time to time; for sacrificer produces food for himself by activity. [85]

¹*dhiyā dhiyā* stands for *dhiyā karmaṇā* which refers to *kriyābuddhiprabandha*.

भुज्यमानान्यपि ततो न क्षीयन्ते प्रबन्धतः ॥८६॥

Therefore foods, though being continuously eaten (thus) never get exhausted through continuity (of *kriyābuddhi*). [86]

यथैव पुरुषो नां भोक्तात्यन्तं तथैव सः ।
कर्ताप्यत्यन्तमेव स्यादन्योन्याव्यरितेकतः ॥८७॥

As the sacrificer himself is verily the enjoyer of the foods so also he is the makerf (of them) since the two (sacrificer and food) have invariable relation. [87]

एवम् प्रबन्धरूपेण साध्यसाधनलक्षणम् ।
अविद्यापटसंवीतचेतसां स्थास्निववेक्ष्यते ॥८८॥

Thus (the food) which is characterized as both the cause and effect through continuity (of *kriyābuddhi*) is understood,¹ in the case of those enraptured by the bandage of Avidyā as permanent as it were. [88]

¹Translation follows variant reading -*veksyate* and not printed text. This is supported by NKL edition and is better acceptable.

एतच्च भण्यते श्रुत्या पुंसो वैराग्यसिद्धये ।
संसारदविरक्तस्य मुक्तीच्छा नेह कस्य चित् ॥८९॥

And this is stated by the Śruti in order to establish aversion on the part of the men who is not averted to transmigratory existence, for indeed there is not noticed here (in this world) the desire for liberation on the part of anyone. [89]

फलहेत्वोर्मिथो न्तं सर्वदाव्यतिरेकतः ।
सम्यग्ज्ञानादृते नास्ति तद्वेतूच्छित्तिकारणम् ॥९०॥

Thus owing to the ever obtaining invariable relation between the cause and the effect (sacrificer and food) there is not a cause for its destruction other than the right knowledge. [90]

This is to justify the second line of the preceding verse.

त्यक्त्वान्यत्सकलं तस्मात्सम्यग्ज्ञानस्य लब्धये ।
मनोवाक्यनुचेष्टाभिर्महान्तं यत्नमाचरेत् ॥९१॥

Therefore man should abandon everything else and make very great effort by his *manas*, Vāk and body with a view to securing the right knowledge. [91]

पुंसो तित्वम् यो वेद तस्येदं फलमेच्यते ।
सो मत्ति प्रतीकेन वृत्त्यान्नं मुख्ययात्ति सः ॥९२॥

Now is stated the result of (Śruti statement) 'He who knows the non-decreasing character of the sacrificer with the *pratīka* 'initial words' in the statement *so 'nnam atti ...*— food he (sacrificer) eats.', as the primary function (of the words shows). [92]

नैवविद्वुणतामेष्टि ह्यन्नं प्रति कदाचन ।
प्रधानभूतः सन्भुङ्क्ते सर्वदान्नं स कामतः ॥९३॥

(The sacrificer) knowing thus does not ever become subordinate to food; being (of) the principle (importance) he ever enjoyed the food at (his) will. [93]

The statement in this verse is in the form of *vyatireka*.

अपि देवान्स संयाति तथोर्जं चोपजीवति ।
प्रशंसैषा यथोक्तस्य विज्ञानस्येति निश्चितिः ॥९४॥

He unites with the gods and also lives on vital food. (*pūṛjam upajīva*) This is the praise of the specific knowledge¹ that is stated (before)— this is the decision. [94]

The first line is the paraphrase of a *praśamsāpara arthavāda*.

¹The word *vijñāna* is explained as *savizeSajJaana*. Cf. our book [Vol.1:1982] Introduction.

अन्नत्रयं यदुत्कृष्टं तस्यायं निर्णयो ना ।
शरीरकार्यसंस्थस्य वर्ण्यते त्मरूपकम् ॥९५॥

There is now a decision regarding that which is the excellent,¹ viz. food which abides in the subtle body and the gross one²— this is of the nature of the body³. [95]

¹Or alternatively, subsequently treated.

²SP translates *śarīra* as *sūkṣma* and *kārya* as *sthūla*.

³This is referred to by the word *aatman*.

प्रयोगसमवायित्वं पूर्वेष्वन्नेषु वर्णितम् ।
भोक्तार्तश्चापि ये तेषां ते श्रुत्योपवर्णिताः ॥९६॥

In respect of the earlier (stated) food there is described their character of being intimately connected with performance (of ritual) and also those who are the enjoyer¹ of them (foods) are described in the Śruti. [96]

¹SP points out man inclusive of *candāla* etc., and Indra and other gods and animals.

प्रयोगसमवायित्वात्पूर्वेषां कर्मणां सताम् ।
मनआधित्रयं कार्यं तादर्थ्येनोत्तरा श्रुतिः ॥९७॥

The earlier (stated foods) being the cause¹ (lit. actions), inasmuch as they are intimately connected with performance the triad beginning with *manas*² is the effect— to convey that meaning (now proceeds) the subsequent (portion of the) Śruti. [97]

¹Sureśvara uses the word *karman* in the sense of *kāraṇa*.

²*manas*, *Vāk* and *Prāṇa*.

Verses 98-154 are the discussion of BU 1.5.3.

उत्पाद्य त्रीण्यथान्नानि मेधया तपसा पिता ।

मनो वाचं तथा प्राणमात्मर्थे तानि चाकरोत् ॥९८॥

Further (sacrificer) having first created by his thought and activity¹ the three foods, viz. *manas*, Vāk and Prāṇa, put into his own² use. [98]

¹This is equivalent to *buddhikriyā* stated earlier in verse 80 and *dhiyā dhiyā* in verse 85.

²We have taken the word *ātmārthe* as equivalent of *svārthe*. That is, the word *ātman* is understood as reflexive pronoun.

मनसो त्वसिद्ध्यर्थं श्रुत्योपन्यस्यते मा ।

सतश्च तस्य कामादिरूपाण्यपि च वक्ष्यति ॥९९॥

(Now) is put forth by the Śruti an argument (lit. inferential statement) in order to establish the existence of *manas* and (the Śruti) will state even the properties¹ of that existing (*manas*, viz. desire etc.) [99]

¹This refers to various *dharma*s. Cf. reference to *dharma* in immediately following verses.

अविद्याधिकृतावस्यां धर्मधर्म्यादिसंगतिः ।

अविद्याकार्यसंस्थैव न त्वसौ प्रत्यगात्मनः ॥१००॥

(Śruti means to convey that) the connection of properties and what has properties is (possible only) in the state governed by Avidyā while one (the individual self) is abiding in what is the effect of Avidyā; and¹ not of the individual self (in its unaffected form). [100]

¹*tu* is here almost for *ca*.

इत्येतत्प्रतिपत्त्यर्थं परो ग्रन्थो तार्यते ।

मा भूत्कामादिधर्मित्वमात्मनीति प्रयत्यते ॥१०१॥

In order to convey (or explain) this, the subsequent¹ portion (of Śruti) is introduced. (Also) there is an effort made to the effect that the character of possessing properties such as desire etc. do not cling to (i.e. become attached to) the Ātman.

[101]

¹This refers to arguments adduced for proving the existence of *manas*.

पृष्ठो जरङ्गं यान्तमद्राक्षीस्त्वमितीतरः ।
ततो त्रमना आसं नातो क्षं त्वदीरितम् ॥१०२॥

Asked (by someone) 'Did you see an old bull goingby?', the person then says 'My mind (*manas*) was elsewhere. Therefore I did not see what you asked about.'

[102]

Worldly usage of the absence or presence of *manas* is adduced as an evidence for proving the existence of *manas*!

विषयान्तरसंबद्धं मनो दृष्टं घटादिवत् ।
आत्मैकसाक्षिकं तच्च ह्युक्तार्थापत्तिसंश्रयात् ॥१०३॥

It is seen that *manas* is, like a pitcher etc., connected with another object and has only the individual self as the seer—this by resorting to the contingency stated before.¹

[103]

This refers to worldly situation stated in preceding verse.

अस्त्यात्मा चित्स्वभावो चक्षुश्चाविकलं तथा ।
सप्रकाशं गवाश्वं च न च पश्यति चेतनः ॥१०४॥

Here¹ there is the Ātman being the nature of sentience and also an eye which is not defective and further the bull or the horse has also light on it and yet the sentient person does not see it.

[104]

In the verse 102 there is no mention of a horse, but this is immaterial.

¹In the case mentioned in verse 102 above.

अतो मीयते न्यद्यस्मिन्नसति नेक्षते ।
द्रष्टादि संहतं सर्वं यस्मिंश्च सति वीक्षते ॥१०५॥

Therefore it is concluded that there is something else,¹ which, not being there,² a person does not see and only while that exists there (in the body) all connected things,³ viz. the seer etc. can one see. [105]

¹That refers to the Ātman, the seer as in verse 103 above.

²That is, not associated with a body.

³The word *samhata* stands for a collection of a seeing person his eyes etc. the object and the light.

यत्तदस्ति मनस्तत्स्यात्प्रसिद्ध्या चास्ति तन्मनः ।
अभून्मम मनो न यतो नादृताक्षमित्यतः ॥१०६॥

Whatever that is is *manas* and that *manas* does not exist (in the situation) by the common usage (lit. known expression),¹ 'Since my mind was else where therefore I did not see (what you asked)'. [106]

SP refers this to Upaniṣadic reference to maker of an arrow. Yet see verse 102 above.

सदप्यात्मादिकं सर्वं दर्शनादावकारणम् ।
मनसैव यतो द्रष्टा गवादीह प्रपश्यति ॥१०७॥

All beginning with the self being there (in the situation of seeing) is not the cause of perception (lit. seeing) since the seer sees a bull etc. only through *manas*. [107]

निःशेषप्रत्ययाधारधर्म्यस्तित्वं प्रसाध्य हि ।
कामादिधर्मसिद्ध्यर्थं काम इत्याद्यथोच्यते ॥१०८॥

Having (thus) established the existence of what possesses the properties (of seeing etc.), the support of entire perception, now there is stated (in the Śruti) *kāma* with a view to establishing properties such as desire. [108]

साधनान्येव मनसो बुद्धिकर्मेन्द्रियाण्यपि ।
सहैवायतनैः सर्वैः प्राधान्यं मनसस्ततः ॥१०९॥

Also, Buddhi 'intellect' and (various) organs of activity are but the means for *manas* together with their abodes (viz. the bodies), therefore *manas* has the status of the principle amongst them. [109]

Buddhi and organs of activity can be means for only when they abide in a body; cf *cakṣuṣ* (*indriya*) is *kṛṣṇatārāgravartī*.

विषयाभिलाषः कामः स्यान्न विशेषे कारणम् ।
इन्द्रियालोचितार्थस्य स्यात्संकल्पो धारणम् ॥११०॥

kāma 'longing for objects' is desire— there is no reason for stating any specific example¹— *saṃkalpa* is deciding (specifically the nature) of an object perceived by a sense-organ. [110]

¹This is an instance when Sureśvara comments on not necessary relevant explanation in the BU of *kāma* as *strīvyatikarābhirāṣa*. Thus this is an example of Vārtika referring to *durukta* in the Bhāṣya.

अनिश्चयात्मिका वृत्तिर्विचिकित्सेत्युदाहृता ।
आस्तिक्यबुद्धिर्ह श्रद्धा स्यादश्रद्धा तद्विरोधिनी ॥१११॥

vicikitsā 'doubt' is now introduced as modification (of Buddhi)

which is of the nature of in decision (regarding an object perceived). *śraddhā* 'faith' is belief in (existence of) an object perceived and *aśraddhā* 'want of faith' is opposed to it (in character). [111]

धृतिश्रद्धे विना न स्युः कामाद्याः कारणादृते ।
यतो मादयो न एवार्थतो मताः ॥११२॥

Without their cause *kāma* etc. would not be there, i.e. without *dhṛti* 'retention' and *śraddhā*, since, in this sentence (of the Śruti), want of *kāma* etc. are stated as objects perceived. [112]

धारणं च धृतिर्ज्ञेया बुद्ध्योपात्तस्य वस्तुनः ।
विपर्ययो तिस्तस्या हीर्लज्जेत्यभिधीयते ॥११३॥

dhṛti is to be understood as grasping (or understanding) oneself from an object grasped by Buddhi; its opposite is *adhṛti*, *hrī* is called what is shame. [113]

विज्ञानं निश्चितं धीः स्याद्भयं भीरभिधीयते ।
एतत्सर्वं मनो ज्ञेयमिति तादात्म्यमुच्यते ॥११४॥

viññāna is Buddhi which has decided *bhī* is called that what is fear— all this should be understood as (various forms of) *manas* (since) here is stated oneness (of cause and effect¹). [114]

¹Effect refers to *ṛtityantara* of *manas*.

बुद्धेश्च मनसश्चैक्यं विवक्षित्वोपसंहतिः ।
इन्द्रियाण्यपि सर्वाणि स्वान्तस्यैव तु वृत्तयः ॥११५॥
यतः सवकार्यनिर्देशः स्वान्तस्य स्पर्शनेन्द्रिये ।
मन एव ततो ज्ञेयं शरीरेन्द्रियसंहतिः ॥११६॥

There is then, after having intended (to convey) the oneness of Buddhi and *manas*, the concluding statement: All the organs

also are but modification of the internal organ (viz. of *manas*); [115]

since in respect of sense of touch there is a mention of the effect of the internal organ therefore the conglomeration of body and organs is to be understood only as *manas*. [116]

In these two verses Sureśvara follows the Sāṃkhya use of the word *vr̥tti* in the sense of modifications of *manas*, viz. effects and cause.

In first line of verse 116 Sureśvara has intended the Upaniṣadic illustration of a man touched by somebody's knee and his knowing the one who knows touches. Thus actually an organ comes into contact with an object and *manas* grasps the same.

पुंसो भोगप्रसिद्ध्यर्थं वैचित्र्यं धीर्निगच्छति ।
दैहेन्द्रियाद्यवस्थाभिरतो धीः सर्वमेव तु ॥११७॥

(Thus) *manas*¹ attends variety (of forms) in order that one (the sacrificer or individual) secures enjoyment; therefore in accordance with various states of the body and organs all is but *manas*. [117]

¹In the verse Sureśvara uses the word *dhīḥ* in the sense of *manas*.

जिघ्रन्ती भवति घ्राणं पश्यन्ती चक्षुरुच्यते ।
शृण्वती भवति श्रोत्रमिति व्यासो भाषत ॥११८॥

(The same *manas*) while smelling becomes (the organ called) *ghrāṇa*: while seeing it is called *cakṣuḥ*, (and further) while hearing it becomes *śrotra*— thus has Vyāsa also declared (explained). [118]

This Vyāsa refers to the author of the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya*. Sureśvara cites earlier authors for showing how his explanation is correct.

शुक्लं कृष्णमणु स्थूलमिति धीः कर्मणो वशात् ।
द्वैताधिकारमापन्ना वैश्वरूप्यं निगच्छति ॥११९॥

Thanks to (variety of) *karman* 'object' *manas*,¹ falling within the compass (province) of duality, becomes while, black, subtle and gross— (thus) it attends variety (of forms). [119]

¹Here also, *dhīh* = *manas*. See note under verse 117.

प्रत्यक्चिद्देशभेदेन न हि शुक्लादिवस्तुनः ।
सत्ता संभाव्यते त्र प्रत्यग्वद्ग्राह्यवस्तुनः ॥१२०॥

Certainly existence of object (like) while etc. is impossible as distinct from sentience in an individual and as obtaining in a place distinct grasped as inner sentience. [120]

Sureśvara affirms here that, really speaking, grasping various objects is owing to appearance *vivarta* of the inner sentience. In other words worldly knowledge is *Avidyā*.

नातः शुक्लादिवस्त्वस्ति बुद्धिरेव क्रियावशात् ।
शुक्लादिरूपतामेति पुरुषार्थप्रसिद्धये ॥१२१॥

Therefore there do not exist objects¹ white etc.; it is just *Buddhi* which owing to (various) activities attains the character of white etc. for securing the end of the individual self. [121]

¹It appears *Buddhi* here stands for *manas*.

धीर्विपर्ययरूपेयं यतः शुक्लादिरूपिणी ।
मन एवेत्यतः प्राज्ञाः सर्वरूपं प्रचक्षते ॥१२२॥

Since this *Buddhi* having the forms white etc. is but *manas* therefore wise ones declare it as possessed of all (variety of) forms. [122]

आत्मार्थेनैव सत्यत्वं कृत्स्नात्मीयस्य वस्तुनः ।
तस्य तन्मात्रयाथात्म्यादिति पूर्वमवादिषम् ॥१२३॥

Having already stated¹ that the reality of all the belongings (lit. things) of one is only by being useful to the individual self for they have real oneness with it alone. [123]

¹In verse 120 above.

अपि सर्वाणीन्द्रियाणि मन एव यतस्ततः ।
पृष्ठो नरः स्पृष्टो मनसैव प्रपद्यते ॥१२४॥

Since all organs are invariably¹ only *manas* therefore a man when troubled even from behind understands by *manas* itself. [124]

This is the meaning of the Upaniṣadic statement *tasmād api* though in earlier verses its purport was explained.

¹This is in force of *api*.

पराङ्मुख उपस्पृष्टः पाणेः स्पर्शो मीदृशः ।
इति स्पर्शविशेषं ना मनसैव प्रपद्यते ॥१२५॥

A man facing backwards, when touched, understood only with *manas* the specific touch as 'This is similar to that of a hand.' [125]

त्वचोपस्पृष्टिमात्रेण स्पर्शमात्रं प्रपद्यते ।
स्पर्शनादिविशेषं तु मनसैव प्रपद्यते ॥१२६॥

By mere touch of the skin he grasps merely that there is touch, but it is only by *manas* that he understands the specific character of touch etc.¹ [126]

¹This 'etc.' indicates the functions of other organs similar

to sense of touch.

मनसैव यतो षकरणस्वार्थधीभवः ।
सर्वं हि मन एवेति श्रुतिराह वचस्ततः ॥१२७॥

Since there is the rise of understanding of their own objects by all the organs only by thanks to *manas* therefore the Śruti has declared that all is indeed *manas*. [127]

मनस्तावत्सुनिर्णीतं शरीरं चेन्द्रियाणि च ।
तदनन्तरतो वाचो व्याख्या प्रस्तूयते ना ॥१२८॥

(So far) is explained *manas* as the body and organs; thereafter is now introduced the explanation of Vāk. [128]

यः कश्चेत्यविशेषोक्तिर्नादवर्णपदोक्तिभिः ।
संयोगोत्थो वियोगोत्थो यश्चापि प्रत्ययात्मकः ॥१२९॥
वागेव स इति ज्ञेयः कुतो यस्मादियं सदा ।
समानयोने रूपस्य वाक्प्रमा बोधिका ॥१३०॥

The Śruti statement *yaḥ haś ca* (means:) That should be taken as Vāk only which is of the nature of the understanding and arises from the combination and separation among the utterances of sound, syllables and words; why (is this so)? (it is so) since this is but illuminating understanding of forms¹ which originates from one source.² [129-130]

¹Singular *rūpasya* is for *rūpāṇām*.

²The common source is the understanding activity of the sacrificer which means production of food (effect).

In this portion units of thought run into more than one verse.

वागेव प्रत्ययादौ स्यादित्येतद्गम्यते कुतः ।
स्वाभिधेयावबोधस्य ह्या समाप्तेरियं यतः ॥१३१॥
यतो र्थं प्रवृत्ता वाग्घटबोधे प्रदीपवत् ।
अर्थावबोधनं कार्यं वाचो नान्यदितो रम् ॥१३२॥

Whence is it understood that it is only Vāk that is in the beginning¹ of perception? (The answer is:) (It is so) since this one (viz. Vāk) is² up to grasping of the meaning³ of its own expression. [131]

Since Vāk has produced beyond the object¹ (*atyartham*), like a lamp in perceiving a pitcher (therefore) the function (or effect) of Vāk is but illuminating⁴ its object and nothing beyond this. [132]

¹Namely, the cause.

²That is, continues to be.

³The word *samāpti* refers to both the end and the obtaining or grasping.

⁴The word *avabodhana* here refers merely to perceiving the object **not grasping**.

शब्दोच्चारणशक्तं हि ननु वाग्निद्रियं मतम् ।
कथं तद्विषयः शब्दो वागित्यत्राभिधीयते ॥१३३॥

(One might ask:) Indeed they understand Vāk as the organ of speech which is capable of uttering a word, how is the word¹ which is (but) its effect² expressed as Vāk. [133]

¹Word equals to *pada* in verse 129 above that is only one aspect of Vāk.

²This is for *viṣaya*, lit. an object.

सत्यमन्यत्र तद्ग्राह्यं तस्य तत्रैव योग्यतः ।
इह त्वन्नयत्रयस्यैव सर्वात्मत्वं विवक्षितम् ॥१३४॥

True¹. That is so understood elsewhere,² for it (the word *vāk*) is properly used to convey only that (sense-organ). Here, however, is intended to convey the nature of the triad of foods as all. [134]

¹Your question is rightly asked.

²This refers to the organ of speech.

मनो :पाति निखिलं रूपं यद्वद्विवक्ष्यते ।
तस्य प्रकाशकस्तद्वत्सर्वः शब्दो विवक्ष्यते ॥१३५॥

As forms¹ which touch² the inner organ is sought to be called *manas* so also all words³ are intended to be expressive of that.⁴ [135]

¹Singular *rūpam* for *rūpāni*.

²That is, is grasped.

³*śabdaḥ* = *śabdāḥ*.

⁴ = sense-organ. Cf. verse 134 above.

प्रकाशस्यैव सर्वस्य शब्दत्वप्रतिपत्तये ।
एषा हि नेत्यतो वक्ति वाग्निन्द्रियनिवृत्तये ॥१३६॥

Therefore in order to understand that (words) which are illuminating all objects, and in order to set aside the sense of (merely) the organ of speech, the Śruti states *eṣā hi na* ... [136]

रूपात्मकं यथा चक्षु रूपस्यैव प्रकाशकम् ।
वाक्च शब्दात्मिका तद्वच्छब्दस्यैवास्तु दीपिका ॥१३७॥

[Verses 137-142 are a short discussion of the view of Bhartr-
prapañca. This has no basis in the BUB therefore this is *anukta*
by Śaṅkara.]

As *cakṣuṣ* which is of the nature of forms of an object illuminates only form so also should Vāk which is of the nature of words be illuminating (lit. a lamp for) only a word. [137]

इति चोद्यं समाशङ्क्य परिहारं प्रचक्षते ।
एषा हि नेति केचित्तु नेयं दीपादिवन्मता ॥१३८॥

With this objection¹ in view some offer an argument in answer:
(The Śruti statement) *eṣa hi na ...* (conveys) that this one
(Vāk) is not understood as similar to a lamp. [138]

¹That is, what is stated in verse 137 above.

श्रोत्रादिकरणग्राह्यं सर्वं तद्रूपमुच्यते ।
तस्य प्रकाशिकैवेयं न प्रकाश्या प्रदीपवत् ॥१३९॥

All that is perceived by sense-organs, ears and others are
called their forms; but this one (viz. Vāk) is illuminative of
(all) that (viz. forms) but is not itself to be illuminated (by
anything else) just like a lamp. [139]

प्रकाश्यमेव चात्यन्तं मनो रूपं यथा तथा ।
प्रकाशिकैव चात्यन्तं वाग्रूपस्येति निश्चितिः ॥१४०॥

And as *manas* is totally the forms which are to be illuminated
(by it) so also thus the Vāk totally illuminates all forms—
such is the decision. [140]

प्रकाश्यमेव रूपं स्यात्प्रकाशो वाक्तथैव च ।
विद्यादेतद्समासेन लक्षणं रूपसंज्ञयोः ॥१४१॥

Illuminator would itself be the form which is to be illuminated;
Vāk also would be like that; this should be known as
explanation in brief of form and name. [141]

नामापि गृह्यमाणं सद्रूपं भवति शैकल्यवत् ।
रूपं च बोधयत्तद्वन्नामपक्षे तिष्ठते ॥१४२॥

Name also, being grasped would be existing like a form having
whiteness and form also revealing itself (to one) would be
on par with name. [142]

एवं वाङ्मनसे सम्यग्व्याख्याय प्रविभागशः ।

तयोर्विधरणः प्राणस्त्वनिरुक्तो भण्यते ॥१४३॥

Having thus clearly explained Vāk and *manas* one by one (*pravibhāgaśas*) how the Śruti explains thier supporter (viz. Prāṇa) which is not explained (so far). [143]

अन इत्यविशिष्टस्य वायोर्ग्रहणमिष्यते ।

स एव प्रादिसंबन्धाद्विशेषार्थो भवेदसुः ॥१४४॥

By the word *ana* is understood (lit. desired) unspecified wind; and the same (Ana), viz. Asu would have specifications thanks to its connection with (*upasargas*) 'beginning with *pra*'.¹ [144]

¹The term *prādi* for the Pāṇini and grammarians is used for some *upasargas* here which has mentioned in verses 145-149.

उत्सर्गो मुखनासाभ्यां पिण्डस्य प्रणतिस्तथा ।

प्राणो नाम मरुद्वृत्तिरपानस्त्वधुनोच्यते ॥१४५॥

अवाग्वायोरपश्वासो देहस्यावाग्गतिस्तथा ।

अपान एष कथितो व्यानः सांप्रतमुच्यते ॥१४६॥

वीर्यवत्कर्महेतुत्वं व्याप्य देहे च वर्तनम् ।

व्यानवृत्तिरियं प्रोक्ता ह्युदानाख्यापि कीर्त्यते ॥१४७॥

योद्यमादिक्रियाहेतुस्तथाभ्यदयकर्मकृत् ।

उत्कर्षहेतुर्देहे तु वृत्तिः सोदानसंज्ञिता ॥१४८॥

समाहरति वृत्तीयो हृद्देशे कीलवत्स्थितः ।

स समान इति ज्ञेयः सर्वकार्योपसंहतिः ॥१४९॥

Upward movement (movement outside) in mouth and nostrils and also advancing of the body and also (of various organs *nābhi* etc.), is what is called (function) Prāṇa; that abides in Marut 'the wind'.

Now is explained Apāna. [145]

This one is called Apāna that is downward (outside) movement of the wind in the body a movement also the downward movement of the body;

Now is explained Vyāna. [146]

Being the cause of action which is full of strength and movement in (the whole of) the body is called the function¹ of Vyāna.

Now is explained (the function) called Udāna. [147]

That function which is the cause of activity like rising up a pitcher and which beings about the worldly property and which is the cause of well-being is called as function Udāna. [148]

The one who combines together (the aforesaid) functins,² residing in the region of the heart like a (firmly driven in) mail is to be known as Samāna. That is to be known as one that leads all activities. [149]

¹Sureśvara uses the word *vṛtti* in verses 147, 148 and 149 but not in verses 145 and 146.

²There is mention made of *vṛttih* 'functions' which were understood in verses 145-148, that indicates words *prāṇa* etc. are functions as well as those who perform them (*vṛttivṛttimat-abhedena nirdeśaḥ*).

यस्यैता वृत्तयः प्रोक्ता वृत्तिमान्सो उच्यते ।
संपूर्यावस्थितो देहं शाकल्यप्रश्ननिष्ठितः ॥१५०॥

That is called Ana, the performer of functions; that is to say; the one whose functions are thus stated (above); having occupied the body it has remained there— (the one) raised in the question of *śākarya*.¹ [150]

¹Reference to BU 4.9.26: *kasminn udānaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ*. The mention of Ana as separate from Prāṇa etc. in the BU is thus explained.

प्राणशब्दः पुरा प्रोक्तो वृत्तिमात्राभिधायकः ।
अन्ते वृत्तिमदर्थः स्यात्सर्वं प्राण इतीरणात् ॥१५१॥

The word *prāṇa* which is used before¹ is expressive merely

of functions but (the one) in the end refers to what performs the functions; this is on the authority of the statement *sarvam prāṇah*. [151]

This verse justifies the note after verse 149 above.

¹In the BU and the BUBV.

नाम रूपं तथा कर्म संहतः सत्तिरदण्डवत् ।
मिथः संकीर्णवृत्तिस्थं देह आत्मेति चोच्यते ॥१५२॥

Name, form and also activity— (this triad) abide in together like three sticks, intermixing their functions and abiding in the body, are called the Ātman.¹ [152]

¹This stands for *deha*.

एतावानेव संघातो देहः प्राणादिरूपकः ।
वाङ्मयो प्राणमयस्तथैव च मनोमयः ॥१५३॥

Only this much of the conglomeration is called body and has the form of Prāṇa etc., then the one which is of the nature of Vāk and one which is possessed of and that which is made up of *manas*. [153]

नामात्र वाङ्मयं सर्वं रूपं सर्वं मनोमयम् ।
तद्वत्प्राणमयं कर्म देहस्यास्यैष संग्रहः ॥१५४॥

In this (context) name is all that is made up of Vāk, form is all that is made up of *manas* and similarly activity of the body is made up of Prāṇa— this is the statement in brief.¹ [154]

¹The term *saṃgraha* is technically to stand for a statement of some proposition in brief.

This is the end of Vārtika on BU 1.4.3.